	Case 2:08-cv-00338-MJP Documen	nt 4 Filed 03/10/08 Page 1 of 3
01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06		
07		
08	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
09	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
10	THOMAS J. PAULSON,	Case No. C08-338-MJP-JPD
11	Plaintiff,	
12	v. )	
13	SNOHOMISH COUNTY JUDICIAL ) OFFICIALS, et al.,	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
14		
15	11	
16	Plaintiff Thomas J. Paulson has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis	
17	("IFP") in this proposed civil rights lawsuit against defendants "Snohomish County Officials	
18	(Judicial Branch)," the "Snohomish County Regional Drug Task Force," "South Snohomish	
19	County Narcotics Task Force," and the "Public Safety Committee." Dkt. No. 1-1. Plaintiff's	
20	complaint is difficult to follow. While purporting to pursue a civil case, plaintiff fails to present	
21	any concrete civil claims; rather, he simply airs general grievances regarding actions of an	
22	attorney—perhaps his former attorney—in certain Snohomish County criminal matters, alleges	
23	random violations of law by the Social Security Administration and Snohomish County	
24	Government officials, and apparently seeks an expungement of sorts. Dkt. No. 1-1. After	
25	careful consideration of plaintiff's IFP application, proposed complaint, the governing law and	
26	the balance of the record, the Court ORDERS as follows:	
	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE – 1	

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), this Court may deny an application to proceed IFP and should dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *O'Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir. 1990). An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

Here, plaintiff has failed to allege sufficient facts to place the defendant on notice of the nature of his claims or otherwise provide any basis for jurisdiction in this Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). His complaint also appears to name as defendants governmental actors who enjoy immunity from suit. *See, e.g., Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 427 (1976); *Pierson v. Ray*, 386 U.S. 547, 553-54 (1967). Furthermore, any attempt to cure the extreme deficiencies in this case would be futile. Because this action appears frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). The fact that plaintiff is not a prisoner does not change this conclusion. *See Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) ("[S]ection 1915(e) applies to all in forma pauperis complaints, not just those filed by prisoners.").

The Court advises plaintiff of his responsibility to research the facts and law before filing a complaint in order to determine whether his claim for relief is frivolous. If plaintiff files a frivolous action, he may be sanctioned. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The Court would likely impose a sanction of dismissal on any frivolous complaint. If plaintiff files numerous frivolous or malicious complaints, the Court may bar him from proceeding in this court. *See DeLong v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146-48 (9th Cir. 1990) (discussing bar order requirements).

Because of the extreme deficiencies in plaintiff's complaint, his request to proceed IFP should be DENIED and this case DISMISSED without prejudice. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A proposed Order of Dismissal accompanies this Report and Recommendation. If plaintiff believes that the deficiencies outlined herein can be cured by an amendment to his complaint, he should lodge an amended complaint as a part of his objections, if any, to this Report and

Recommendation.

DATED this 10th day of March, 2008.

MES P. DONOHUE

United States Magistrate Judge

ames P. Donolaue

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION PAGE -3